

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the comments set forth fully below. In view of the Advisory Action mailed on May 11, 2010, this response is a Supplemental Response to the Amendments and Remarks filed on April 28, 2010, which were in response to the Office Action mailed on March 3, 2010. Claims 1-47 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-47 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 6, 11, 20, 29, 46 and 47 have been amended, and Claims 19, 28 and 37 have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-18, 20-27, 29-36 and 38-47 are currently pending.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-18, 20-27, 29-36, 46 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078161 to Cheng (hereinafter “Cheng”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0044355 to Cheshire (hereinafter “Cheshire”). Although Applicant respectfully disagrees, to further prosecution, Applicant has amended the Claims. Within the Office Action, it is stated that Claims 19, 28 and 37 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the above amendments, Claim 19 has been incorporated into Claim 11, Claim 28 has been incorporated into Claim 20 and Claim 37 has been incorporated into Claim 29. Consequently, Claims 19, 28 and 37 have been canceled. Therefore, the independent Claims 11, 20 and 29 are now allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination.

Claims 12-18 are all dependent on the independent Claim 11. As described above, the independent Claim 11 is allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 12-18 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 21-27 are all dependent on the independent Claim 20. As described above, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 21-27 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 30-36 are all dependent on the independent Claim 29. As described above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 30-36 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Claims 1, 6, 46 and 47 have been amended to include similar claim language that has been found allowable, specifically, using a bridge with a rendezvous type

interface circuit configured to couple to the rendezvous type device operating under a rendezvous type protocol wherein the rendezvous type interface circuit comprises a rendezvous type proxy which maintains a table of entries, each entry corresponding to one of universal plug and play type devices. Therefore, Claims 1, 6, 46 and 47 are also now allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination.

Claims 2-5 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-5 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 7-10 are all dependent on the independent Claim 6. As described above, the independent Claim 6 is allowable over the teachings of Cheng, Cheshire and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 7-10 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

**Allowed Claims**

Within the Office Action, Claims 38-45 have been allowed.

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 so that any outstanding issues can be quickly and efficiently resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: July 1, 2010

By: /Jonathan O. Owens/

Jonathan O. Owens  
Reg. No.: 37,902  
Attorneys for Applicants